



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,994	12/19/2000	Freeland Glen Young III	52493.000131	2704
7590	02/21/2006		EXAMINER	
Hunton & Williams 1900 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006-1109			LE, UYEN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/738,994

Applicant(s)

YOUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen T. Le

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendments to the drawings are insufficient to cure the deficiencies addressed in the previous Office Action. Consequently, objection to the drawings is maintained.

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that AAPA does not teach or suggest numerous recitations of claim 1. In response, the examiner disagrees.

The claimed "providing one or more instructions for receiving the representative appointment information" has to be present for the computer aided method of AAPA to receive representative appointment information.

The claimed "providing one or more instructions for analyzing and sorting the received representative appointment information" is met by the fact that the information received is used to maintain and update a set of paper files with the support of a computerized database system (see page 1, last paragraph). One or more instructions has to be provided for analyzing and sorting the received representative appointment information since the information is used to maintain and update a set of paper files.

The claimed "providing one or more instructions for saving the received representative appointment information" has to be present for the computerized database system of AAPA to keep track of the received information.

Applicant argues that neither AAPA nor Loofbourrow alone or in combination teaches or suggests a need for the features offered by other. In response, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicant presents no further argument. For all the reasons stated above, rejection to all claims is maintained using the references of record.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because all blocks of Figure 1 have to be labeled for ready identification. Figures 4-7 are not readable.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an

application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) at pages 1-2 of record, in view of Loofbourrow et al (US 6,505,183) of record.

Claims 1, 2 merely recite what is being done by AAPA at paragraph 0004. AAPA clearly teaches that the method is done with the support of a computerized database system at paragraphs 0003, 0004. The difference is AAPA does not specifically show presenting an interactive display of the received representative appointment information and allowing interactive access via the Internet to the displayed and presented received representation information. However, it is well known in the art as shown by Loofbourrow to access human resource knowledge via the Internet (see the abstract, Figure1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed interface while implementing the method of AAPA in order to allow

ready access to information using the convenience of the Internet as taught by Loofbourrow.

Regarding claim 3, representative status clearly changes over time. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include current and pending representative information.

Regarding claim 4, AAPA teaches that representative appointment information change (see 0004). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide instructions for inputting a date range and for displaying the information modified within said inputted date range in order to keep track of changes during a specific time period.

Regarding claim 5, AAPA teaches submission of updates to the representative appointment information and accepting and processing updates when AAPA shows updates are requires and processed (see 0004).

Regarding claims 6-11, since the method of AAPA is done with support from a computerized database, clearly such a database has to include fields to identify entries regarding a representative appointment. Furthermore, all the claimed fields have to be present since they are critical to track information regarding each representative appointment. AAPA clearly shows the importance of such identification fields when AAPA shows that “commonly a single appointed representative can be responsible fro creating millions of dollars in financial obligations for an appointing insurance company (see 0003).

Claims 12-22, 23-33 correspond respectively to a computer program product and system for performing the method of claims 1-11, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1-11 above.

Regarding claim 34, the one or more instructions has to be provided by a user to an application server having a processor module since the method of AAPA and Loofbourrow allows a user to update appointment information over the Internet (see 0004 AAPA and Figure 1 of Loofbourrow).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-4021. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/738,994
Art Unit: 2163

Page 7

7 February 2006



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER